

### REMARKS

In reply to the Final Office Action of September 6, 2007, Applicants have not amended or canceled any claims. New claim 64 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-25, 27-28, 30-31, 33-49, 52, and 54-64 are pending, with claims 1, 13, 17, 52, and 64 in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for his indication that, if rewritten in independent form with the limitations of the intervening claims, claims 8, 36, and 37 would be allowable. In this reply, new independent claim 64 has been added which includes the features of claims 1, 30, 33, and 36 that Applicants believe correspond to the Examiner's reasons for indicating that claim 36 would be allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that claim 64 be allowed.

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9, 12, 15, 17-18, 27-28, 30-31, 33-35, 38, 43-46, 52, 55-58, and 60-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carey et al. (U.S. 6,274,924, "Carey") in view of Shimozawa (JP 10-303464, "Shimozawa"). Independent claims 1 and 17 cover leadframes and housings that include "a separately manufactured thermal connecting part disposed in [an] opening and fastened into [a] mount part to form an electrical connection with the at least one external electrical connecting strip." Independent claim 52 covers leadframes that include "a separately manufactured thermal connecting part disposed in the opening of the mounting region and secured to the mounting region to form an electrical connection with [a] first electrically conductive component." The Examiner has acknowledged that Carey does not disclose a separately manufactured thermal connecting part that forms an electrical connection with an external electrical connecting strip, but alleges that "Shimozawa discloses in figure 1 the separately manufactured thermal connecting part 10 forming an electrical connection with the at least one external electrical connecting strip 2 via the conductive adhesive 11 so that the heat can be further dissipated away from the LED in an efficient manner," (Office Action at page 3), and alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Carey to include a thermal connecting part that forms an electrical connection with at least one external electrical connecting strip "so that the heat can be further dissipated away from the LED in an efficient manner" (Office Action at page 3). Applicants disagree, as Carey specifically teaches

away from providing a thermal connecting part that forms an electrical connection to an external electrical connecting strip.

Carey discloses LED packages that include a “heat-sinking slug 10” (Carey, col. 2, line 22) and a “light-emitting diode (LED) die 16 [that] is mounted directly or indirectly via a thermally conducting sub-mount 18 to the slug 10” (Carey, col. 2, lines 26-28). Carey’s slug 10 does not form an electrical connection with an external electrical connector. To the contrary, slug 10 is explicitly not connected to leadframe 12. Carey states that “[b]ond wires extend from the LED 16 and the submount 18 to metal leads on leadframe 12 that are electrically and thermally isolated from the slug 10” (Carey, col. 2, lines 28-31). That is, Carey’s slug 10, which corresponds most closely with the thermal connecting part of claims 1, 17, and 52, is not electrically connected to the leadframe.

The Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Carey to include a thermal connecting part (e.g., slug 10) that is electrically connected to leadframe 12. Applicants disagree, because Carey specifically teaches away from such a modification. In the Background section, Carey discusses shortcomings of prior art LED packages, stating that “prior art packages lack thermal isolation between the electrical and thermal paths because the electrical leads are the primary thermal paths” (Carey, col. 1, lines 30-32). According to Carey, this creates problems whereby “the packaged die are subject to thermal stresses from the temperature cycling” (Carey, col. 1, lines 32-33). Carey further states that “[s]ince prior art packages use their electrical leads as primary thermal paths, the high thermal resistance of these paths combined with the high thermal resistance of the external system creates high junction temperatures ... [which] contributes to accelerating the irreversible loss of photometric efficiency in the LED chip and also accelerates processes that contribute to the failure of mechanical integrity of the LED package” (Carey, col. 1, lines 46-55). Carey emphasizes that to avoid such problems in his LED packages, leadframe 12 is “electrically and thermally isolated from the slug” (Carey, col. 2, lines 4-5). Thus, one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have had any reason to modify Carey’s LED package according to Shimozawa in view of Carey’s clear teaching away from such a modification.

The Examiner has further alleges that modifying Carey’s LED package according to Shimozawa would allow heat to be “dissipated away from the LED in an efficient manner”

(Office Action at page 3). However, according to Carey, “[t]he insert-molded leadframe 12 is a patterned metal part that provides high electrical conductivity but only low thermal conductivity” (Carey, col. 3, lines 1-3, emphasis added). In other words, leadframe 12 is not an efficient conductor of thermal energy, and does not provide an efficient path for dissipation of heat energy from Carey’s LED.

To the contrary, dissipating heat through leadframe 12 would likely introduce some or all of the disadvantages that Carey discloses, namely acceleration of the irreversible loss of photometric efficiency in the LED chip and acceleration of LED package failure. Thus, one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have modified Carey’s LED package to include a connection between slug 10 and leadframe 12 to achieve better heat dissipation, as alleged by the Examiner, because Carey explicitly states that leadframe 12 is a poor thermal conductor, and therefore would form an ineffective heat dissipation pathway.

Therefore, neither Carey nor Shimozawa discloses or suggests the leadframes and housings covered by claims 1, 17, and 52, and one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have modified Carey’s LED packages according to Shimozawa as alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Each of claims 2, 6-7, 9, 12, 15, 18, 27-28, 30-31, 33-35, 38, 43-46, 55-58, and 60-63 depends from one of claims 1, 17, or 52, and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, Applicants specifically wish to address the rejection of claims 6 and 7. Claim 6 covers leadframes in which the wire connecting area “is disposed at a higher level than said chip mounting area as viewed from said chip mounting area.” The Examiner alleges that “Carey et al. teaches in column 2, lines 26-31 the bond wires extend from the LED 16 and the surmount 18 to metal leads on lead frame ... [a]s such, the wire connecting area must be disposed at a higher level than the chip mounting area as viewed from the chip mounting area” (Office Action at pages 3-4). Applicants traverse, and can find no basis in Carey for the Examiner’s unsubstantiated inference.

To the contrary, based on Figure 2 of Carey, it is not at all clear that the wire connecting area, which corresponds to a portion of leadframe 12, must be disposed at a higher level than the chip mounting area (e.g., the upper surface of sub-mount 18). Carey is silent with regard to the

relationship between the wire connecting area and the chip mounting area, and he does not disclose or even acknowledge any advantage to the claimed relationship between the wire connecting area and the chip mounting area. Therefore, in the absence of any positive disclosure in Carey, it cannot be fairly stated that Carey discloses the subject matter of claim 6. Moreover, Shimozawa fails to cure Carey's deficiencies, as the wire connecting area in Shimozawa (see Shimozawa, Figure 1, side electrode 4) is not "at a higher level than said chip mounting area," as required by claim 6. Accordingly, neither Carey nor Shimozawa disclose or suggest the leadframes covered by claim 6.

Claim 7 covers leadframes in which the reflector well has an edge, and the "wire connecting area is disposed above said edge as viewed from said chip mounting area." The Examiner alleges that "Carey et al. discloses in figure 2 the reflector well 14 has an edge ... and the wire connecting area must be disposed above the edge as viewed from the chip mounting area" (Office Action at page 4). Applicant traverses, and can find no basis in Carey for the Examiner's statement.

To the contrary, Figure 2 of Carey shows the relationship between leadframe 12 – which corresponds to the wire connecting area – and the edge of reflector well 14. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it appears from Figure 2 of Carey that the wire connecting area is disposed below the edge of reflector well 14, not above the edge of the reflector well as recited in claim 7. Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Carey of a wire connecting area disposed above the edge of a reflector well, as required by claim 7. Moreover, Shimozawa fails to disclose a reflector well at all (see Shimozawa, Figure 1). Accordingly, neither Carey nor Shimozawa disclose or suggest the leadframes covered by claim 7.

Therefore, for each of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 6-7, 9, 12, 15, 18, 27-28, 30-31, 33-35, 38, 43-46, 55-58, and 60-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carey and Shimozawa in view of Barnett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,903,380, "Barnett"). The Examiner admits that Carey and Shimozawa each fail to disclose a thermal connecting part and a mount part connected via welding, but alleges that "Barnett et al. discloses in figure 2 the thermal connecting part 14 and the mount part 54 being connected by welding (col. 9, lines 62-

65)” (Office Action at page 7). The Examiner further alleges that “it would have been obvious ... to modify Carey et al. and Shimozawa by having the thermal connecting part and the mount part being connected by welding to effectively provide an electrical connection” (Office Action at page 7).

Applicants traverse. Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and cover leadframes in which a thermal connecting part and a mount part are connected by “at least one of a crimped connection, a riveted connection, a soldered connection, and a welded connection.” Applicants agree that neither Carey nor Shimozawa discloses such connections between a thermal connecting part and a mount part. In addition, it would not have been obvious to modify Carey according to the teaching of Barnett to provide the claimed connections.

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Carey specifically teaches away from a LED package that includes a connection between a thermal connecting part and a mount part. Carey states that “prior art packages lack thermal isolation between the electrical and thermal paths ... [and as] a result, the packaged die are subject to thermal stresses from the temperature cycling” (Carey, col. 1, lines 30-33). Carey further states that “accumulated mechanical stresses reduce the overall LED reliability” (Carey, col. 1, lines 43-45).

Based on Carey’s disclosure, one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would therefore have found no reason to modify Carey to provide a “laser welded or otherwise mechanically coupled” (Barnett, col. 9, lines 64-65) connection between slug 10 and leadframe 12. To the contrary, Carey’s disclosure would have suggested that it is important to maintain electrical isolation between slug 10 and leadframe 12. Thus, one of skill in the art would not have combined Carey, Shimozawa, and Barnett in the manner proposed by the Examiner.

Applicants submit that claims 3 and 4 are patentable over Carey, Shimozawa, and Barnett. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-11 and 19-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carey and Shimozawa in view of Waitl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,624,491, “Waitl”). Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1, and claims 19-25 depend from claim 17. As discussed above, claims 1 and 17 are patentable over Carey and Shimozawa because it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art to modify Carey to provide a mount part that “form[s]

an electrical connection” to an external electrical connecting strip or component, as required by claims 1 and 17.

Waitl does not cure the deficiencies of Carey and Shimozawa with regard to claims 1 and 17. Waitl discloses a diode housing in which “a contact metallization 18 bonds a first surface” (Waitl, col. 4, lines 61-62) of a LED chip to an external electrode 4. However, as discussed above, Carey specifically teaches away from providing an electrical connection between a thermal connecting part and a mount part. Thus, one of skill in the art would have found no reason to modify Carey according to the teaching of Waitl to provide the subject matter of claims 1 and 17.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 17 are patentable over Carey, Shimozawa, and Waitl. Claims 10-11 and 19-25, each of which depend from one of claims 1 and 17, are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants also wish to specifically address the rejection of claims 22, 24, and 25. Claim 22 covers housings that include “a reflector well forming a first part of a reflector” and “side walls of [a] radiation outlet window form[ing] a second part of said reflector ... and said well merges to said second part.” The Examiner alleges that “said thermal connecting part 20 has a reflector well 30 forming a first part of a reflector (figure 1 of Minoru); said sidewalls of the radiation outlet window 10 form a second part of the reflector (figure 1 of Waitl et al.); and said well 30 merges to the second part 12” (Office Action at page 9). Applicants traverse, for the following reasons.

Applicants note that the Examiner refers to Minoru on page 9 of the Office Action. Applicants assume that this is a typographical error, and that Waitl is the reference that is being applied in the current Action.

It is not at all clear how the Examiner proposes to combine Carey, Shimozawa, and Waitl to yield the housings covered by claim 22. Carey discloses (e.g., see Figure 2 of Carey) a reflector well 14 with vertical sides. Shimozawa does not disclose a reflector well at all. Waitl discloses (e.g., see Figures 1 and 3 of Waitl) a reflector well with angled sides. None of Carey, Shimozawa, or Waitl discloses or suggests “a reflector well forming a first part of a reflector” and “side walls of [a] radiation outlet window form[ing] a second part of said reflector ... and

said well merges to said second part” as required by claim 22, and the Examiner provides no indication of how Carey, Shimozawa, and Waitl can be combined to yield the claimed housings.

In fact, the rejection of claim 22 is a hindsight reconstruction, using claim 22 as a template to reconstruct the invention by picking and choosing isolated disclosures from the prior art. This is impermissible under the law. For example, in *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992), the Federal Circuit stated:

It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or “template” to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 987, 18 USPQ2d 1885, 1888 (Fed. Cir. 1991). This court has previously stated that “[o]ne cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.” (quoting *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d at 1075, 5 USPQ2d at 1600)

The present rejection of claim 22 fits the court’s description of what may not be done under § 103. The Examiner has merely listed certain features of Applicant’s invention and then located isolated disclosures of certain components that may or may not correspond to the claimed features, without indicating how or why the components would be combined. The law requires more than that.

Claim 24 covers housings where the chip has a main emission direction, the “reflector well has reflector walls,” the “radiation outlet window has reflector surfaces,” and the “reflector walls and ... reflector surfaces are at different angles with respect to the main emission direction.” The Examiner alleges that “the combination of Carey et al. and Waitl et al. discloses the chip 40 has a main emission direction; said reflector well 30 has reflector walls (figure 1 of Minoru); said radiation outlet window 10 has reflector surfaces 12 (figure 1 of Waitl et al.); and said reflector walls and the reflector surfaces are at different angles with respect to the main emission direction” (Action at pages 9-10). Applicants traverse, for the following reasons.

Applicants note that the Examiner refers to Minoru on page 9 of the Office Action. Applicants assume that this is a typographical error, and that Waitl is the reference that is being applied in the current Action.

It is not at all clear how the Examiner proposes to combine Carey, Shimozawa, and Waitl to yield the housings covered by claim 24. None of Carey, Shimozawa, or Waitl discloses or suggests reflector walls and reflector surfaces that “are at different angles with respect to the main emission direction” as required by claim 24. Furthermore, the Examiner provides no indication of how or for what reason the teachings of Carey, Shimozawa, and Waitl would be combined by one of skill in the art at the time of the invention. In fact, the rejection of claim 24 amounts to no more than a hindsight reconstruction, as none of Carey, Shimozawa, or Waitl discloses or suggests the claimed housings.

Claim 25, which depends from claim 24, covers housings for which “an angle between said reflector walls and the main emission direction is greater than an angle between said reflector surfaces and the main emission direction.” The Examiner alleges that “the combination of Carey et al. and Waitl et al. discloses an angle between the reflector walls 12 (figure 1 of Waitl et al.) and the main emission direction being greater than an angle between said reflector surfaces 30 (figure 1 of Minoru) and the main emission direction” (Office Action at page 10). Applicants traverse, for the following reasons.

Applicants note that the Examiner refers to Minoru on page 10 of the Office Action. Applicants assume that this is a typographical error, and that Waitl is the reference that is being applied in the current Action.

As discussed above in connection with claim 24, the Examiner provides no indication of how or for what reason the teachings of Carey, Shimozawa, and Waitl would be combined by one of skill in the art at the time of the invention. None of Carey, Shimozawa, or Waitl discloses or suggests a housing where “an angle between said reflector walls and the main emission direction is greater than an angle between said reflector surfaces and the main emission direction” as required by claim 25. In fact, as for claim 24, the rejection of claim 25 amounts to no more than a hindsight reconstruction.

Therefore, for each of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-11 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 13-14 and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carey and Shimozawa in view of Han et al. (US Publication No. 2001/0054761, “Han”). Independent claim 13 covers leadframes that include “a separately



manufactured thermal connecting part disposed in [an] opening and fastened into [a] mount part to form an electrical connection with the at least one external electrical connecting strip.” As discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 17, neither Carey nor Shimozawa discloses the leadframes covered by claim 13. Moreover, it would not have been obvious for one of skill in the art to modify Carey’s LED packages to include an electrical connection between heat-sinking slug 10 and leadframe 12. To the contrary, Carey states that “metal leads on leadframe 12 ... are electrically and thermally isolated from the slug 10” (Carey, col. 2, lines 29-31, emphasis added). That is, Carey’s heat-sinking slug is explicitly not electrically connected to the leadframe. In contrast, claim 13 requires a thermal connecting part that “form[s] an electrical connection” with an electrical connecting strip.

According to Carey, connections between the use of electrical leads as thermal paths creates problems whereby “the packaged die are subject to thermal stresses from the temperature cycling” (Carey, col. 1, lines 32-33). Carey emphasizes that to avoid such problems in his LED packages, leadframe 12 is “electrically and thermally isolated from the slug” (Carey, col. 2, lines 4-5). Thus, a person of skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have had any reason to modify Carey’s LED package according to Shimozawa in view of Carey’s clear teaching away from such a modification.

Moreover, according to Carey, “[t]he insert-molded leadframe 12 is a patterned metal part that provides high electrical conductivity but only low thermal conductivity” (Carey, col. 3, lines 1-3, emphasis added). In other words, leadframe 12 is not an efficient conductor of thermal energy, and does not provide an efficient path for dissipation of heat energy from Carey’s LED. Thus, a person of skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have modified Carey’s LED package to include a connection between slug 10 and leadframe 12 to achieve better heat dissipation because Carey explicitly states that leadframe 12 is a poor thermal conductor, and therefore would form an ineffective heat dissipation pathway.

Han fails to cure the deficiencies of Carey and Shimozawa regarding claim 13. There is no reason to modify Carey’s disclosure according to Han or to any other reference to provide an electrical connection between slug 10 and leadframe 12, particularly in view of Carey’s clear teaching away from such a modification. Based on Carey’s disclosure, one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found no reason to modify Carey’s LED package to provide

a mount part that “form[s] an electrical connection” to an external electrical connecting strip, as required by claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 13 is patentable over Carey, Shimozawa, and Han, and respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 14 and 59 each depend from claim 13, and each is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 59 is also requested.

Claims 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carey and Shimozawa in view of Hochstein (U.S. Patent No. 6,517,218, “Hochstein”). Without addressing the merits of the Examiner's proposed combination of Carey and Hochstein, Applicants note that claims 39 and 40 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Carey and Shimozawa, at least because the leadframes covered by claim 1 are neither disclosed by, or obvious over, Carey or Shimozawa, alone or in combination. Furthermore, there would have been no reason to modify the teachings of Carey according to Hochstein or to another reference to provide an electrical connection between a thermal connecting part and a mount part, at least because Carey explicitly teaches away from providing such an electrical connection.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Carey, Shimozawa, and Hochstein. Claims 39 and 40, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over Carey, Shimozawa, and Hochstein for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 41-42 and 47-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carey and Shimozawa in view of Matsumoto et al. (JP 402187058, “Matsumoto”). Without addressing the merits of the Examiner's proposed combination of Carey and Matsumoto, Applicants note that claims 41-42 and 47-48 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Carey and Shimozawa, at least because the leadframes covered by claim 1 are neither disclosed by, or obvious over, Carey or Shimozawa, alone or in combination. Furthermore, there would have been no reason to modify the teachings of Carey according to Matsumoto or to another reference to provide an electrical connection

between a thermal connecting part and a mount part, at least because Carey explicitly teaches away from providing such an electrical connection.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Carey, Shimosawa, and Matsumoto. Claims 41-42 and 47-48, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over Carey, Shimosawa, and Matsumoto for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 41-42 and 47-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carey and Shimosawa in view of Mahulikar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,608,267, "Mahulikar"). Without addressing the merits of the Examiner's proposed combination of Carey and Mahulikar, Applicants note that claim 49 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Carey and Shimosawa, at least because the leadframes covered by claim 1 are neither disclosed by, or obvious over, Carey or Shimosawa, alone or in combination. Furthermore, there would have been no reason to modify the teachings of Carey according to Mahulikar or to another reference to provide an electrical connection between a thermal connecting part and a mount part, at least because Carey explicitly teaches away from providing such an electrical connection.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Carey, Shimosawa, and Mahulikar. Claim 49, which depends from claim 1, is patentable over Carey, Shimosawa, and Mahulikar for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 54 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carey and Shimosawa in view of Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6,664,649, "Huang"). Without addressing the merits of the Examiner's proposed combination of Carey and Huang, Applicants note that claim 54 depends from claim 17. As discussed above, claim 17 is patentable over Carey and Shimosawa, at least because the leadframes covered by claim 17 are neither disclosed by, or obvious over, Carey or Shimosawa, alone or in combination. Furthermore, there would have been no reason to modify the teachings of Carey according to Huang or to another reference to provide an electrical connection between a thermal connecting part and a mount part, at least because Carey explicitly teaches away from providing such an electrical connection.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 17 is patentable over Carey, Shimozawa, and Huang. Claim 54, which depends from claim 17, is patentable over Carey, Shimozawa, and Huang for at least the same reasons as claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants believe that all pending claims are patentable, and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which Applicants have: (a) addressed certain comments of the Examiner does not mean that Applicants concede other comments of the Examiner; (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for the patentability of those claims and other claims; or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that Applicants concede any of the Examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

The fees for excess claims in the amount of \$50.00 are being paid concurrently on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Enclosed is a check for excess claim fees. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 12406-127001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/31/07

/Marc M. Wefers Reg. No. 56,842/

Marc M. Wefers

Reg. No. 56,842

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906